

***IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE***

Applicant: Fumitoshi MIZUTANI et al.  
Title: DATA PROCESSING APPARATUS AND DATA PROCESSING METHOD  
Appl. No.: 10/827,433  
Filing Date: 4/20/2004  
Examiner: Srinivasa R. Reddivalam  
Art Unit: 2419  
Confirmation Number: 2720

**INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**  
**UNDER 37 CFR §1.56**

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Submitted herewith on Form PTO/SB/08 is a listing of documents known to Applicant in order to comply with Applicant's duty of disclosure pursuant to 37 CFR §1.56.

A copy of each non-U.S. patent document and each non-patent document is being submitted to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR §1.97 and §1.98.

The submission of any document herewith, which is not a statutory bar, is not intended as an admission that such document constitutes prior art against the claims of the present application or that such document is considered material to patentability as defined in 37 CFR §1.56(b). Applicant does not waive any rights to take any action which would be appropriate to antedate or otherwise remove as a competent reference any document which is determined to be a *prima facie* art reference against the claims of the present application.

**TIMING OF THE DISCLOSURE**

The listed documents are being submitted in compliance with 37 CFR §1.97(c), before the mailing date of any of a final action under 37 CFR §1.113, a notice of allowance under 37 CFR §1.311, or an action that otherwise closes prosecution in the application.

**RELEVANCE OF EACH DOCUMENT**

The documents listed on the attached PTO/SB/08 were cited as being relevant during the prosecution of the corresponding Japanese application. A copy of the Japanese Office Action dated December 22, 2009 is attached. A partial English translation of the Japanese Office Action follows:

Remarks

(1) Claim 1 recites, "a plurality of reception interface sections which receive same data whose data length is shorter than one period of said sync signal generated by said frequency divider --- ". The "data length" refers to the size of data, and the "one period of a sync signal" refers to the width of one period at a certain frequency. The "data length" and the "one period of a sync signal" are different unit terms. They cannot be compared in terms of length. The technical significance of the above recitation of claim 1 is unclear. Therefore, it is not possible to clearly understand the invention of claim 1.

(2) Claim 2 recites, "said data sender". However, claim 1, which is quoted by claim 2, does not recite "data sender" as a constituent element. Therefore, the invention of claim 2 is not clear.

In view of the above, the invention of claims 1 and 2 is not clear.

If a reason for rejection is later determined, it will be notified accordingly.

Reason why this Notification is final

This Notification is limited to rejections triggered solely by an amendment(s) made in response to the First Notification of Reasons for Refusal.

Record of Prior Art Literature Search Result  
Field searched

IPC    G06F 11/16-11/20  
         G06F 15/16-15/177  
         G06F 11/14  
         G05F 13/00  
         G05F 15/00  
         G06F 11/28-11/34  
         H04L 1/00, 1/08-1/24

Prior Art Literature

National Patent Publication No. 2001-526422  
Unexamined Japanese Patent Application KOKAI  
Publication No. 2001-290668  
Unexamined Japanese Patent Application KOKAI  
Publication No. H10-154085  
Unexamined Japanese Patent Application KOKAI  
Publication No. H02-264337  
Unexamined Japanese Patent Application KOKAI  
Publication No. H01-154242  
Unexamined Japanese Patent Application KOKAI  
Publication No. H11-296394  
Unexamined Japanese Patent Application KOKAI  
Publication No. H04-071037  
Unexamined Japanese Patent Application KOKAI  
Publication No. H08-278950

This record of the prior art literature search results provides no reasons for rejection.

The other documents listed in the Office Action have previously cited in an Information Disclosure Statement filed December 22, 2008.

Unless otherwise indicated, no English translation is readily available (not considering machine-generated translations that may be freely available online, to both the Applicant and the PTO) for each of the non-English language documents. However, a commercially

available English language abstract is provided herewith, where indicated on the attached Form PTO/SB/08. Inasmuch as Applicants have endeavored to provide at least one item that complies with the requirement for a "concise explanation of relevance" for each of the non-English language documents, each of these documents has been submitted in compliance with the PTO requirements and should be considered by the Examiner (37 CFR §1.97, §1.98 and MPEP §609).

Applicant respectfully requests that each listed document be considered by the Examiner and be made of record in the present application and that an initialed copy of Form PTO/SB/08 be returned in accordance with MPEP §609.

**STATEMENT**


The undersigned hereby states in accordance with 37 CFR §1.97(e)(1) that each item of information contained in this information disclosure statement was first cited in any communication from a foreign patent office in a counterpart foreign application not more than three (3) months prior to filing of this Statement.

Although Applicant believes that no fee is required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be due to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 10, 2010

By



FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Customer Number: 22428  
Telephone: (202) 945-6014  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 38,072